2:08-cv-01168-JCM-RJJ). This case was dismissed *with prejudice* pursuant to a stipulation between the parties in July of 2009. (Doc. #4-1). The property was then sold to HSBC on October 22, 2009. (Doc. #4-23).

Subsequently, plaintiffs collectively filed another complaint on March 8, 2010 (Case No. 2:10-cv-00700-PMP-PAL), naming several defendants, including MERS, that were named in the previous complaint. (Doc. #4-24). The case, which was almost identical to the 2008 case, was dismissed with prejudice on July 19, 2010, based on both estoppel grounds and substantive issues. (Doc. #4-2). A motion to set aside this order was filed (doc. #4-27) by the plaintiffs, but was denied on September 29, 2010. (Doc. #4-28).

Finally, less than two weeks later, on September 29, 2010, plaintiffs filed yet another complaint which is identical to the complaint filed in March of the same year. The present complaint, which was filed in the above captioned case, contains the *same parties* and *same claims* as the case that was dismissed with prejudice in July (doc. #4-2).

Defendants assert that the present complaint should be dismissed as well, due to the fact that the claims have already been adjudicated. The principal of res judicata bars a plaintiff from reasserting claims that have already been adjudicated. *Clark v. Bear Stearns &Co.*, 966 F.2d 1318, 1320 (9th Cir. 1992); *McClain v. Apodaca*, 793 F.2d 1031, 1033 (9th Cir. 1986). Further, claims based on the same "transactional nucleus of facts" which "could have been asserted, whether they were or not, in a prior suit between the same parties" are barred under res judicata. *Costantini v. Trans World Airlines*, 681 F.2d 1199, 1201-02 (9th Cir. 1982).

Here, not only have the same defendants been named in previous cases, but the very same claims and identical complaint have been previously dismissed. Both the 2008 complaint and the March 2010 complaint stemmed from the same property and "transactional nucleus of facts" as the present litigation. *Id.* Not only was the exact same complaint dismissed in July of 2010 (doc. #4-2), but any new claims the plaintiffs may wish to add to their present complaint by amending it, as they assert they can, "could have been asserted" in either of the prior suits, and are barred under res judicata. *Id.*

	Case 2:10-cv-01987-JCM -LRL Document 17 Filed 01/31/11 Page 3 of 3
1	Accordingly,
2	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that defendants HSBC Bank
3	U.S.A, N.A, HSBC Mortgage Corp. U.S.A, Merscorp, Inc, and Mortgage Electronic Registration
4	Systems, Inc.'s motion to dismiss (doc. #4) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED.
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above captioned case (Case No. 2:10-cv-01987-JCM
6	-LRL) be, and same hereby is, DISMISSED with prejudice.
7	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the defendants' request for release of lis pendens (doc. #4)
8	be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED.
9	DATED this 31st day of January, 2011.
10	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12	OTTED WITTED DISTRICT GODGE
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	